## **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 2 and 7.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,049,865 issued to Nakamura, *et al.* ("Nakamura") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,265,833 issued to Kim, *et al.* ("Kim"). This rejection is moot in light of the amendments made to claims 1 and 15, which Applicants respectfully submit are allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended claim 1 recites, inter alia:

a control circuit which selects one of scanning modes as an operation mode in response to a mode switching signal, and outputs a data signal and a scan control signal based on an image signal to be displayed and said selected scanning mode, wherein a current of said data signal is based on said selected scanning mode, said scanning modes including a mode where at least two scanning electrodes are simultaneously driven;

Amended claim 15 recites, inter alia:

a control circuit which selects one of scanning modes as an operation mode in response to a mode switching signal, and outputs a data signal and a scan control signal based on an image signal to be displayed and said selected scanning mode, said scanning modes including a mode

Application No.: 09/974,855 Reply dated April 11, 2006 Response to Office Action of January 11, 2006

where at least two scanning electrodes that were not simultaneously selected are simultaneously driven;

Neither Nakamura nor Kim, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest such features. To the contrary, Nakamura teaches a dual electrode scanning mode where units of two electrodes are simultaneously selected and driven (col. 2, lines 62-68; Figs. 2H-2K and Figs. 8H-8K). Therefore, assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Hence, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, which is an allowable claim. Hence, claims 2 and 16-18 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 16-18 are patentable over the references of record.

Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 3-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nakamura and Kim in view of EP Application Publication 0617399 of Kuwata, *et al.* ("Kuwata"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 3-14 depend from claim 1, which is an allowable claim, and Kuwata does not cure the deficiency of Nakamura and Kim because Kuwata also teaches simultaneous selection and driving of scanning lines (col. 2, lines 34-35; col. 3, lines 2-4, 13-16; col. 5, lines 47-53; col. 12, lines 35-47; Figs. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 11). Hence, claims 3-14 are also allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-18. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in

Application No.: 09/974,855 Reply dated April 11, 2006 Response to Office Action of January 11, 2006

any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Application No.: 09/974,855 Reply dated April 11, 2006

Response to Office Action of January 11, 2006

**CONCLUSION** 

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending

Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection

have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all

pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of

this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at

the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park

Reg. No. 50,114

Date: April 11, 2006

Customer No. 58027

--11--